[Mr. Chairman] announcements made. It appears that the Commerce Minister held open House discussions with the representatives of trade and industry on the 10th August, 1985, in New Delhi. There was no fixed agenda and the representatives of trade an,} industry were free to raise any points that they deemed appropriate. As per the practice, the Commerce Minister wag to respond to some of the points raised during the discussions on the sport. I am given to understand that open House discussion is not a forum for making major policy announcements. It is a iorum primarily for taking administrative action on the spot. The Minister announced his decisions on several points such as abolition of MEP on tea, extension of IPRS to alloys, steel, etc., creation of separate Export Promotion Council for electronic goods and computer soft-ware creation of a separate division in the Ministry of Commerce to take care of services sector, constitution of a task force to review the duty drawback, reduction of bonding charges of export oriented units, etc. These are in the nature of removing procedural irritants and bottlenecks in the export endeavour.

It is now well established that no privilege of the House is involved if statements on matters of public interest are not made first in the House. However, it is a breach of propriety for a Minister to make a policy statement outside the House of Parliament while it is in session. Kaul and Shakdher in their volume 'Practice and Procedure in Parliament' have correctly summarised the rulings in both Houses of Parliament in the following words;

> "It has also been held that policy statements should first be made on the floor of the House, when the House is in session, before releasing them to the Press or the Public. But Ministers cannot be prohibited from making statements outside the House if such statements are not contrary to the declared policy of the Government."

The question at issue is whether the announcements made by the Minister for Finance and Commerce either amount to an announcement of a new policy, change in policy or are contrary to declared policy. Taking the announcement of abolition of MEP on tea, it may be noted there was a change in the effective rate of duties to cope with the trends in externa] markets and no question of policy is involved in it. Similarly the extension of IPRS to a few more commodities does not involve any question of policy.' I, therefore, rule that there has been no breach of accepted proprieties involved in the announcements made by the Minister for Finance and Commerce in the open House discussion.

The Minister further contended that these were administrative decisions and that, therefore, no breach of propriety was involved in the case. Such a broad proposition[1] is not warranted by the earlier rulings of Parliament. It is conceivable that some administrative decisions may involve either a change or infringement of an existing policy and may have to be made first in the House. It is not necessary to rule on this point as I have already held that the impugned announcements by the Minister for Finance and Commei'ce are not statements of policy.

For the foregoing reasons, I hold no breach o" propriety is involved in the announcements made by the Minister for Finance and Commerce outside the House on the 10th August, 1985.

PAPERS LAID ON THE TABLE

MR. CHAIRMAN**:** Now PapeVs to be laid on the Table.

I. Reports of the Monopolies and Restrictive Trade Practices Commission in the cases of M's Peico Electronics and Electricals Limited. Calcutta and M|s. Ciba *Geigy* of India Limited Bombay.

II. Notification of the Ministry of Industry and Company Affairs Publishing the companies (Acceptance of Deposits) Third Amendment Rules, 198".

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF INDUSTRY AND COMPANY AFFAIRS (SHRI ARIF MOHD. KHAN): Si/, I beg ;o lay on the Table—

I. A copy each (in English and Hindi) of the following papers, under section 62 of the Monopolies and Restrictive Trade Practices Act, 1969:—

(i) Report of the Monopolies and Restrictive Trade Practices Commission, under section 21(3) <b) of the Monopolies and Restrictive Trade Practices Act, 1969, in the case of Mjs. Feic$_0$ Electronics and Electricais Limited, Calcutta, for industrial licence for the manufa cure of Mini Computer/Micro Processor Based Sys-[1]ems at their existing factory at Pimpri, District Pune, in the State of Maharashtra and an Exemption letter dated the 26th June, 1985 of the Central Government thereon, together with an explanatory note. Placed in Library. See No. LT-1345186],

(ii) Report of the Monopolies Restrictive Trade Practices Commission, under section 12(3)(b) of the Monopolies and Restrictive Trade Practices Act, 1969, in the case of Mjs. Ciba Geigy of India Limited, BombDv, for the manufacture of Isooproturon—a wheat herbicide—at their existing factory at Santa, Monica, Corlim. Goa and an Order dated the 7th June, 1985 of the Central Government thereon, together with $_a$n explanatory note. TPlaced in Library. See No. LT-1344/85].

SHRI ARIF MOHD. KHAN; Sir, I also beg to lay on the Table a copy (in English and Hindi) of the Ministry of Industry and Company Affairs). (Department of Company Affairs) Notification G.S.R. No. 482(E), dated the 5th June, 19a5, publishing the Companies (Acceptance of Deposits) Third Amendment Eu'es, 1985, under sub-section (3) of section 642 of the Companies Act, 1956. [Placed in Library. Se$_e$ No. LT-1310/85],

REPORT OF THE PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE

SHRI NIRMAL CHATTERJEE (West Bengal); Sir, I beg to lay on the Table a copy (in English Hindi) of th$_e$ Tenth Report of the Public Accounts Committee on Action Taken on 154th Report (7th Lok Sabha) regarding Coaching Services.

MESSAGE FROM THE LOK SABHA

The Indian Railways (Amendment) Bill, 1985

SECRETARY-GENERAL; Sir, I have to report to the House the following message received from the Lok Sabha signed by the Secretary-General of the Lok Sabha:

"In accordance with (he provisions of Rule 96 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha, I arci directed to enclose the Indian Railways (Amend-Sabha at its pitting held on the 14th Sabha at its sitting held on the 14th August, 1985.

Sir, I lay the Bill on the Table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION BY MISS JAYALALITHA

MR. CHAIRMAN: Now, Personal Explanation by Mi$_{ss}$ Jayalalitha:

MISS JAYALALITHA (Tamil Nadu); Mr. Chairman, Sir, I thank you vtery much for permitting me to make this Personal Explanation under Rule 241.

Sir, on Tuesday, the 13th August,. 1985, in a reply to Unstarred Question-